

## Remarks

In the Office Action of April 4, 2005, Claims 13-19, 27 and 28 were allowed. Claims 6-12 and 23-26 were objected to as depending from a rejected claim. This is not correct. Claim 6 is an independent claim and Claim 7 depends from Claim 6 and Claim 8 depends from Claim 7. Accordingly, Claims 6-8 are allowable. Claim 9 is an independent claim and Claims 10-12 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 9. Accordingly, they are allowable. Claim 23 is an independent claim. Claims 24-26 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 23. Accordingly, they are allowable.

During a telephone conference with Examiner Horton on June 1, the error in the Office Action relating to objected to Claims 6-12 and 23-26 was discussed. It was mutually agreed that upon pointing out that these objected to claims were in fact independent families of claims and not dependent upon any rejected claims, they should be allowed.

In view of the cancellation of Claims 1-5 and 20-22 and the allowance or allowability of remaining claims 6-19 and 23-28, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

CAHILL, VON HELLENS & GLAZER P.L.C.



C. Robert von Hellens  
Reg. No. 25,714

155 Park One  
2141 E. Highland Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
(602) 956-7000  
c:\Clients\Regina, Samuel\ToPTO\A-3Response-Jun05